

**REMARKS**

The Office Action in the above-identified application has been carefully considered and this amendment has been presented to place this application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-15 are in the present application. It is submitted that these claims were patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. The changes to the claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. sections 101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Claims 1-3, 6-8, and 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Vilhuber (U.S. Patent 6,470,453). The present claims recite “said connection request including a connection source identification for identifying said connection source.” (Claims 1, 6, and 11) The present invention uses an ID corresponding to the connections source (e.g. a printer) for connecting with the predetermined connection destination (e.g. a printer service center server). (Specification page 17, lines 1-3) Further, the “predetermined connection destination include[es] plural connection source identifications for identifying a plurality of connection sources; the predetermined connection destination judg[es] whether said connection source is a predetermined connection source by checking said connection source identification against said plural connection source identifications.” (Claims 1, 6, and 11) In other words, the predetermined connection destination stores IDs for a number of connection sources and checks

the ID received in the connection request against the stored IDs before granting permission for the connection.

By contrast, Vilhuber discloses “at block 32, a network access server receives a request to establish a connection with a client. The request may be received as the result of a user operating a client to dial into a network access server to request a connection to be established.” (Column 9, lines 53-59) Vilhuber does not disclose using an ID for the client or that the server contains IDs for a number of clients as required in the present invention. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Vilhuber fails to anticipate the present invention and the rejected claims should now be allowed.

Claims 4, 9, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vilhuber in view of Tateyama (U.S. Patent 5,844,813). Tateyama is relied upon solely to meet the “printer” limitations in the dependent claims. However, like Vilhuber as discussed above, Tateyama fails to meet the “connection source identification” limitations of the independent claims. Accordingly, the combination of Vilhuber and Tateyama fails to obviate the present invention and the rejected claims should be allowed.

Claims 5, 10, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vilhuber in view of Tateyama and Petterutti et al. (U.S. Patent 5,997,193). Petterutti is relied upon to meet the present invention’s limitation of “said printer is connected to said predetermined connection destination using a trigger signal issued upon initial power-up.” (Claims 5, 10, 15) However, as shown in Figure 6 and discussed at Column 7, lines 15-31, Petterutti simply discloses the printer power-up initializes 90 and then executes a subroutine

"Get Application Program/Data" 92. Hence Petterutti fails to disclose "a trigger signal" for connecting to a connection destination as required in the present claims. Accordingly, the combination of Vilhuber, Tateyama and Petterutti fails to obviate the rejected claims, which should now be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application as now presented is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

An extension of time fee is deemed to be required for the filing of this amendment. No additional fees are anticipated, but if such are required, the Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:   
Darren M. Simon  
Reg. No. 47,946  
(212) 588-0800